

From: Cyran, Carissa [Cyran.Carissa@epa.gov]
Sent: 12/23/2021 8:42:46 PM
To: Collazo Reyes, Yvette [CollazoReyes.Yvette@epa.gov]; Dennis, Allison [Dennis.Allison@epa.gov]; Diaz, Catherine [Diaz.Catherine@epa.gov]; Drinkard, Andrea [Drinkard.Andrea@epa.gov]; Freedhoff, Michal [Freedhoff.Michal@epa.gov]; Garcia, Beth [garcia.beth@epa.gov]; Goodis, Michael [Goodis.Michael@epa.gov]; Hanley, Mary [Hanley.Mary@epa.gov]; Hartman, Mark [Hartman.Mark@epa.gov]; Hauff, Amanda [Hauff.Amanda@epa.gov]; Henry, Tala [Henry.Tala@epa.gov]; Hughes, Hayley [hughes.hayley@epa.gov]; Kaiser, Sven-Erik [Kaiser.Sven-Erik@epa.gov]; Keigwin, Richard [Keigwin.Richard@epa.gov]; Kochis, Daniel [Kochis.daniel@epa.gov]; Kramer, George [Kramer.George@epa.gov]; Labbe, Ken [Labbe.Ken@epa.gov]; Layne, Arnold [Layne.Arnold@epa.gov]; Messina, Edward [Messina.Edward@epa.gov]; Nguyen, Khanh [Nguyen.Khanh@epa.gov]; OPP Branch Chiefs [OPP_Branch_Chiefs@epa.gov]; OPP Deputy & Associate Directors [OPP_Deputy_& _Associate_Directors@epa.gov]; OPP Division Directors [OPP_Division_Directors@epa.gov]; OPP IO [OPP_IO@epa.gov]; OPPT Managers [OPPT_Managers@epa.gov]; OPS CSID CB [OPS_CSID_CB@epa.gov]; Picone, Kaitlin [Picone.Kaitlin@epa.gov]; Pierce, Alison [Pierce.Alison@epa.gov]; Pinto, Ana [Pinto.Ana@epa.gov]; Richmond, Jonah [Richmond.Jonah@epa.gov]; Romanovsky, Anna [Romanovsky.Anna@epa.gov]; Schmit, Ryan [schmit.ryan@epa.gov]; Siciliano, CarolAnn [Siciliano.CarolAnn@epa.gov]; Smith, Carolyn [smith.carolyn@epa.gov]; Sullivan, Melissa [sullivan.melissa@epa.gov]; Tyler, Tom [Tyler.Tom@epa.gov]; Vendinello, Lynn [Vendinello.Lynn@epa.gov]; Vernon, Jennifer [Vernon.Jennifer@epa.gov]
Subject: OCSPP News for December 23, 2021 - Happy holidays!

OCSPP Daily News Round-Up

Toxics

- E&E News 12/23; [Burnout, expertise gaps plague EPA chemicals office](#)
- Inside TSCA 12/22; [EPA Delays Cumulative Risk Guide To 2022 Amid Calls For Public Input](#)
- Inside TSCA 12/23; [PEER Says EPA Ignored Recent Cancer Findings In New-Chemicals Review](#)

PFAS

- Inside TSCA 12/22; [PFAS Treatment Costs Could Boost Class-Based TSCA 'Source Reduction'](#)

Pesticides

- Michigan Farm News 12/22; [AFBF questions accuracy of EPA dicamba report — so does EPA](#)

Blog/OpEd/Other

- Bergeson & Campbell Blogs 12/23; [EPA Reopens Dockets for 20 High-Priority Substances](#)
- Beyond Pesticides 12/21; [Review Shows that Monsanto/Bayer Claims of Glyphosate Safety Not Supported by Credible Science](#)
- JD Supra 12/23; [The EPA's PFAS Strategic Roadmap Indicates Considerable New Regulations are Imminent](#)

+++++

Burnout, expertise gaps plague EPA chemicals office

E.A. CRUNDEN, E&E News

<https://subscriber.politicopro.com/article/eenews/2021/12/23/burnout-expertise-gaps-plague-epa-chemicals-office-284672>

Key EPA programs are facing a steep staffing shortage that some employees worry will imperil critical chemicals work and certain Biden administration priorities, even as advocates say the agency has no real plan for fixing the problem.

Parts of the Office of Chemical Safety and Pollution Prevention lack badly needed personnel, according to agency staff, posing issues for programs focused on new and existing chemicals. EPA is aware of the problem and has noted the need to attract and retain staff within those programs. But critics say that despite the acknowledgement, EPA is doing very little to improve gaps or morale.

"It's been bad for a really long time," said Kyla Bennett, who directs science policy for the nonprofit watchdog group Public Employees for Environmental Responsibility, about staffing. "I don't think the public fully understands just how bad. I think they'd be stunned if they knew."

EPA's chemicals office is tasked with some of the most pressing work facing the Biden administration, including chemical risk assessments and research on per- and polyfluoroalkyl substances, or PFAS. Michal Freedhoff, EPA's chemicals chief, told the House Energy and Commerce Committee in October that her office was struggling, citing "a staff under stress" operating with "less than 50 percent" of the resources needed to do their jobs (E&E Daily, Oct. 28).

PEER believes the extent of the issue is far greater and questions whether EPA has a real plan to fix the problem. The group filed a public records request asking for documents detailing how the agency is acting to counter scientific staffing hurdles. But EPA turned over only a workforce analysis from 2015 to 2020.

That document, shared with and first reported by E&E News, shows that attrition rates in the Office of Pollution Prevention and Toxics hovered just under 9 percent last year. That office is housed within OCSPP and oversees key risk assessment work for both new and existing chemicals, among other duties.

EPA did not clarify if the attrition rate is still the same for the office, and it is unclear how OPPT might match up to similar parts of the agency. According to the Environmental Data and Governance Initiative, overall staff losses at EPA between 2016 and 2020 were at 7.4 percent, the greatest loss of personnel across government agencies surveyed.

An overall lack of staff isn't the only problem facing the Office of Pollution Prevention and Toxics — expertise in specific areas is also an issue. PEER noted cancer experts and inhalation specialists as examples of knowledge the agency currently needs. Without that insight, the group cautioned, some of the agency's most important public health work could be compromised.

Low morale

Staffing issues and low morale have been documented issues within the Office of Pollution Prevention and Toxics. A leaked 2020 Federal Employee Viewpoint Survey for the office showed workers were unhappy with many elements of their jobs, to a disproportionate extent relative to other parts of the agency.

For example, across EPA, approximately 20 percent of staff felt they could not "disclose a suspected violation of any law, rule or regulation without fear of reprisal." But for OPPT, that number was 43 percent. It was even higher within that office's Risk Assessment Division, with 56.1 percent feeling negatively about the issue.

The survey yielded similar trends for questions regarding satisfaction within position and reviews of senior leadership. Certain responses also generated even more dramatic numbers — in response to the statement "my workload is reasonable," more than half of OPPT employees answered negatively. For Risk Assessment Division staff, that number was 79.1 percent.

Those responses came during the Trump administration, which saw turmoil rock the chemicals office repeatedly. But employees say the problems are long-running and have continued under the Biden administration.

Two Office of Chemical Safety and

EPA Delays Cumulative Risk Guide To 2022 Amid Calls For Public Input

Maria Hegstad, Inside TSCA

<https://insideepa.com/tsc-news/epa-delays-cumulative-risk-guide-2022-amid-calls-public-input>

EPA has pushed its long-awaited guidelines for analyzing cumulative risks from overlapping chemical exposures and other hazards from a late 2021 target to "early 2022," but the agency is maintaining that it will not take comments on the document despite stakeholders' arguments that it is important enough to warrant a public-comment process.

An agency spokesperson told Inside TSCA on Dec. 14 that the "draft document is currently undergoing internal review. . . . We anticipate publication of the Guidelines for Cumulative Risk Assessment Planning and Problem Formulation in early 2022" -- which represents a delay from EPA's earlier pledge to release the final guide in 2021.

Once finalized, the guide will be a key factor in the agency's environmental justice agenda -- and could particularly aid the Toxic Substances Control Act (TSCA) office's efforts to revise Trump-era chemical evaluations to consider risks facing

“fenceline” communities that are exposed to several distinct toxic chemicals as well as other health hazards.

But the agency has yet to release the draft for public scrutiny -- it did take comment in 2013 on earlier efforts to craft the guidance -- and the spokesperson did not directly respond to Inside TSCA’s queries regarding whether there would be a public comment period.

EPA quietly conducted a peer review of the draft last summer though without public notice.

But the spokesperson said Dec. 21 that the draft guidelines “underwent an independent contractor-led panel peer review earlier this year, consistent with EPA’s Peer Review Handbook. . . . Currently, the document is going through internal EPA review. When that is complete, the document will be released as final on EPA’s website.”

However, a former EPA official says that if the agency moves forward with that plan, it is likely to face push-back over the decision to craft the guide entirely in private, not only from stakeholders angered over the lack of a public-comment process but also White House offices that would ordinarily review such a document.

“I expect there will [be] a big stink if it is completed and issued without any public input,” the source says. “At the very least, [the White House Office of Management and Budget] might fuss, since, in recent years, risk assessment guidelines had to go them and to [the White House Office of Science Technology Policy] for interagency review before public review. I have no idea if either group has seen them at any stage thus far.”

The former official did note, however, that EPA’s statement refers to a document titled “Draft Guidelines for Cumulative Risk Assessment Planning and Problem Formulation,” which may indicate that officials plan to finalize the initial steps of the cumulative risk assessment process rather than a complete guidance document.

If so, “they may . . . argue that doesn’t fit the definition of” an influential document that requires public comment or a public peer review, the source says.

‘Years Have Passed’

Nevertheless, an environmentalist tells Inside TSCA, “It is surprising that there has been no public information or public input requested, especially when this issue is something that so many fenceline communities and groups concerned about environmental justice have called for and waited for, as years have passed.”

The environmentalist notes that the cumulative risk guide has been a major concern for stakeholders since the George W. Bush administration, as it stands to impact how the agency applies a host of laws including TSCA, the Clean Air Act (CAA) and Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act (FIFRA).

“We and many dozens of other groups submitted comments on this in 2013 -- and the science since then has only developed further to show how critical it is for EPA to use the best available science to account more fully for the real-world impacts and health risks chemicals cause, and to use EPA’s full legal authority under various laws -- including TSCA, FIFRA and ...

PEER Says EPA Ignored Recent Cancer Findings In New-Chemicals Review

Diana DiGangi, Inside TSCA

<https://insideepa.com/tsca-news/peer-says-epa-ignored-recent-cancer-findings-new-chemicals-review>

Public Employees for Environmental Responsibility (PEER) is asking EPA’s Office of Inspector General (OIG) to investigate what it says is the TSCA new-chemicals office’s policy of refusing to consider new toxicity data on existing substances -- and argues the agency used that stance to ignore studies linking a common solvent to cancer.

In a Dec. 21 complaint to OIG, the environmental whistleblower group claims that EPA in 2019 improperly declined to conduct a new risk assessment on the solvent parachlorobenzotrifluoride (PCBTF) despite a National Toxicology Program (NTP) study released the previous year that showed “clear evidence of carcinogenic activity” in a cancer bioassay of rats and mice.

Rather, PEER says, staff reviewing a Toxic Substances Control Act (TSCA) pre-manufacture notice (PMN) for a new chemical

made with PCBTF were told that a decades-old policy memo barred them from updating a prior risk assessment of the solvent to incorporate NTP's findings.

"Despite these new hazard data and significant exposures, EPA staff were not allowed to assess PCBTF risks in the new chemical," and ultimately concluded that the substance was "not likely to present risks," reads PEER's summary of the complaint.

The group's press release on the filing says that directive relied on a "convoluted misinterpretation" of a 1985 TSCA policy memo.

"EPA management relied on a 1985 memo to argue that they lacked the authority to assess the risks of PCBTF -- an existing chemical -- in a new chemical substance. This convoluted misinterpretation also blatantly ignored EPA's legal duty to -- at least -- notify the manufacturer and the general public of the unreasonable risks so that they can take voluntary actions to mitigate risk," PEER says.

It continues that the memo in question is titled "PMN Policy Guidelines Memorandum #2: Review of Risks Posed by Existing Chemicals in the New Chemicals Program (NCP)," and sets out terms for how staff should consider existing chemicals as part of a PMN review -- terms that EPA managers in 2019 said put sharp limits on staff's authority to assess existing chemicals.

"The problem is that EPA does not regularly assess risks for chemicals that were grandfathered in under the first Toxic Substances Control Act in 1976, or because new data were developed after the chemical was brought to market," PEER says. "In addition, when a new chemical contains existing chemicals, EPA will not, as a matter of practice, allow risk assessors to include newly discovered risks of the existing chemical" in their reviews.

But, the group continues, the 1985 memo "explicitly states that '[t]he NCP should refer to the ECP [Existing Chemicals Program] a potential unreasonable risk posed by activities involving a PMN substance where the PMN substance by itself does not support the risk finding where the risk represents but a single manifestation of an existing, widespread, and generalized problem."

The release says officials' "convoluted misinterpretation also blatantly ignored EPA's legal duty to -- at least -- notify the manufacturer and the general public of the unreasonable risks so that they can take voluntary actions to mitigate risk."

More broadly, the complaint argues that the 1985 memo "does not preclude EPA from managing risks from existing chemicals under Section 5 of TSCA," and even if it did, "the 2016 Lautenberg Act amended TSCA in such a way that would allow it to do so now."

'Green' Exemption

In its Dec. 22 press release, PEER further argues that EPA not only approved the PMN for a chemical made with PCBTF, but has continued to promote it as a "green" chemical exempt from limits on other volatile organic compounds (VOCs) intended to reduce ozone pollution.

According to the release, PCBTF "is used in the synthesis of dyes, pharmaceuticals, pesticides, cleaners, degreasers, and as a solvent, mainly in paint and coating formulations," and from 2012 and 2015, between 10 and 50 million pounds of the chemical ...

PFAS Treatment Costs Could Boost Class-Based TSCA 'Source Reduction'

Diana DiGangi, Inside TSCA

<https://insideepa.com/tsca-news/pfas-treatment-costs-could-boost-class-based-tsca-source-reduction>

Environmentalists say water utilities' concerns about the cost of treating their supplies for per- and polyfluoroalkyl substances (PFAS) provides fresh justification for class-based TSCA limits on the chemicals, following recent warnings from several water groups on the pitfalls of a treatment-based approach compared with "source reduction."

Drinking water groups are ramping up their push for EPA to focus its PFAS strategy on cutting use of the chemicals, including

through a new cost analysis that warns current methods of removing perfluorinated chemicals from water come with high costs and may not prevent contamination from reoccurring because the substances are so difficult to destroy.

Kyla Bennett, a former wetland permit reviewer at EPA and now the New England director of Public Employees for Environmental Responsibility (PEER) says those findings have reinforced her belief that “there’s no way to remove [PFAS] from wastewater.”

She continued, “We can filter it out of drinking water, we can filter it out of groundwater, at great cost. . . . But because PFAS is so persistent, and because of the lifecycle, if you incinerate it, it gets airborne and then sinks down to the ground and contaminates soil and water. If you landfill it, it gets out and goes to the wastewater treatment plant and gets back into your drinking water.”

Those complications mean “the only way to get a handle on this situation is to turn it off at the top” by limiting its use, through the Toxic Substances Control Act (TSCA), she said.

PEER and other environmental groups have long pushed for EPA and other agencies to limit use of PFAS as a class rather than targeting individual chemicals. That strategy has had mixed success so far; several states have adopted class-based PFAS rules, but though federal officials are pursuing a TSCA testing approach based on dividing perfluorinated substances into “subgroups” there is no plan for broad regulations under the toxics law.

Rather, the agency’s top priority for PFAS rules has been drinking water standards for two of the most prominent chemicals in the class, PFOA and PFOS, set for proposal in 2022.

But the water groups’ cost analysis, crafted by the National Association of Clean Water Agencies (NACWA), the Water Environment Federation and the North East Biosolids & Residuals Association, says complying with such rules will make drinking water treatment much more expensive.

For instance, it finds that utilities faced with PFAS concerns see their costs for biosolids management rise by an average of 37 percent.

It adds that such agencies often faced limits on their capacity to dispose of the waste since many authorities ban “beneficial reuse” contaminated biosolids such as applying it as fertilizer. And it notes that “there is no proven or established technology to treat PFAS in wastewater or remove PFAS from biosolids,” although there are several “emerging” methods under investigation.

While the report does not make specific policy recommendations, such concerns have already spurred calls from the sector for EPA to emphasize “source reduction” in its PFAS policies. For instance, during a Dec. 10 Great Lakes PFAS forum, Wisconsin environment chief Darsi Foss said It sounds a lot like we’re going to be leaning a lot on the Toxic Substances Control Act. . . . I think this is a bold new use of TSCA.”

Cost Concerns

Separately, Wisconsin water utilities recently joined industry groups to argue that the state Department of Natural Resources should hold off on any drinking water PFAS rules, and instead wait for EPA to issue its own rule that might consider costs.

The Wisconsin State Journal reports that the municipal utility coalition MEG-Water said in Dec. 7 comments that it “is concerned with the Department’s proposal to establish drinking water standards without weighing the relative costs and benefits of those standards and the precedent that this may set for establishing future state drinking water...”

AFBF questions accuracy of EPA dicamba report — so does EPA

NA, Michigan Farm News

<https://www.michiganfarmnews.com/afbf-questions-accuracy-of-eпа-dicamba-report-so-does-epa>

AFBF is joining grower groups that call on EPA to give more background on recent data related to off-target complaints for dicamba during the 2021 growing season.

According to the EPA report, which was released Tuesday, there was “little change in number, severity, or geographic extent of dicamba-related incidents when compared to the reports the Agency received before the 2020 control measures were required.”

EPA said it received nearly 3,500 reports in 2021, alleging effects from off-target movement of dicamba onto various nontarget vegetation, including cotton and soybean varieties that are not dicamba-tolerant. In its report, EPA says the number of incidents is actually higher, stating “generally, pesticide incidents are underreported.”

Along with the American Soybean Association and National Cotton Council (NCC), AFBF has significant concerns about the accuracy of the EPA’s data.

The groups say it’s not clear whether complaints were submitted to multiple sources/regulators and were therefore double counted, and if EPA, state regulators — or others — investigated complaints to verify injury or assess potential causes.

EPA itself questions the accuracy, explaining in the report that state lead agencies lack appropriate resources to thoroughly investigate alleged drift incidents and acknowledges that incidents reported by multiple entities may be double counted, which would inflate the number of dicamba complaints.

Even with doubts of data accuracy, EPA notes in the dicamba report summary that it is “reviewing whether over-the-top dicamba can be used in a manner that does not pose unreasonable risks to non-target crops and other plants, or to listed species and their designated critical habitats.”

EPA adds it is also evaluating all options for addressing future dicamba-related incidents, noting it will work with any states that look to further restrict over-the-top uses of dicamba.

“The decisions EPA makes regarding herbicides have wide-ranging consequences for America’s farmers and ranchers, so they should be made after careful review and consideration of peer-reviewed science,” said AFBF President Zippy Duvall.

“The stakes are simply too high to make major label changes without due diligence from EPA to learn all the facts surrounding reported incidents. America’s farmers deserve a fair process as they work to use climate-smart practices to produce food, fuel and fiber for our nation.”

In October 2020, EPA approved new five-year registrations for two dicamba products and extended the registration of another. All three registrations included new control measures to ensure these products can be used effectively while protecting the environment, including non-target plants, animals, and other crops not tolerant to dicamba.

“EPA’s report doesn’t align with what the U.S. cotton industry has seen and heard in the field,” said NCC Chairman Kent Fountain, a Georgia cotton producer.

“The data needs to be analyzed carefully to ensure accuracy because dicamba is too important to our industry for decisions to be made on incomplete or faulty data.”

EPA Reopens Dockets for 20 High-Priority Substances

Lynn L. Bergeson and Carla N. Hutton, Bergeson & Campbell Blogs

<http://www.tscablog.com/entry/epa-reopens-dockets-for-20-high-priority-substances>

The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) has reopened the online dockets for 20 high-priority substances. According to the December 9, 2021, memorandum authorizing the re-opening of the dockets, EPA is re-opening these dockets to receive use, hazard, exposure, and any other information that can help inform their risk evaluations. Information must be submitted by June 9, 2022, when EPA will close the dockets. Information submitted to the docket should be identified by the docket identification (ID) number associated with the relevant chemical. The 20 high-priority chemicals are:

p-Dichlorobenzene;
1,2-Dichloroethane;
trans-1,2-Dichloroethylene;

o-Dichlorobenzene;
1,1,2-Trichloroethane;
1,2-Dichloropropane;
1,1-Dichloroethane;
Dibutyl phthalate (DBP) (1,2-Benzene-dicarboxylic acid, 1,2-dibutyl ester);
Butyl benzyl phthalate (BBP) (1,2-Benzene-dicarboxylic acid, 1-butyl 2-(phenylmethyl) ester);
Di-ethylhexyl phthalate (DEHP) (1,2-Benzene-dicarboxylic acid, 1,2-bis(2-ethylhexyl) ester);
Di-isobutyl phthalate (DIBP) (1,2-Benzene-dicarboxylic acid, 1,2-bis-(2-methylpropyl) ester);
Dicyclohexyl phthalate;
4,4'-(1-Methylethylidene)bis[2,6-dibromophenol] (TBBPA);
Tris(2-chloroethyl) phosphate (TCEP);
Phosphoric acid, triphenyl ester (TPP);
Ethylene dibromide;
1,3-Butadiene;
1,3,4,6,7,8-Hexahydro-4,6,6,7,8,8-hexamethylcyclopenta [g]-2-benzopyran (HHCB);
Formaldehyde; and
Phthalic anhydride.

The docket ID number and contact information for each chemical lead is available in the memorandum.

Review Shows that Monsanto/Bayer Claims of Glyphosate Safety Not Supported by Credible Science

NA, Beyond Pesticides

<https://beyondpesticides.org/dailynewsblog/2021/12/review-shows-that-monsanto-bayer-claims-of-glyphosate-safety-not-supported-by-credible-science/>

A research team undertaking a review of industry-conducted glyphosate safety studies submitted to EU (European Union) regulators shows that most of the research fails to meet current international standards for scientific validity. The researchers find that of the 11 reviewed studies, which were submitted to regulators by Bayer AG (now owner of the Monsanto “Roundup” brand of glyphosate herbicide) and several other chemical companies, only two are scientifically “reliable”; six others are deemed “partly reliable,” and the remaining three, “not reliable.” These results go, in part, to the age of some of the studies (see below); but they also underscore the point Beyond Pesticides has made for years. Regulators, whether in the UK, the U.S., or anywhere else, ought not be relying solely and without adequate auditing on industry-generated and -funded safety research in making safety determinations that underlie regulations impacting the well-being of millions of people (and other organisms), never mind the environment writ large.

The report, from a team working out of the Institute of Cancer Research (ICR) at the Medical University of Vienna, is timely: the European Food Safety Authority (EFSA) and European Chemicals Agency (ECHA) are currently considering whether or not to renew EU approval of glyphosate when the existing license expires in December 2022. In 2017, glyphosate was granted, by a narrow vote margin, a five-year renewal following the European Parliament’s vote against renewal. According to The Guardian, “The analysis comes at a critical time as Bayer and a contingent of companies calling themselves the Glyphosate Renewal Group are again asking European regulators to reauthorize glyphosate ahead of the expiration of approval next year, and as the industry battles to preserve glyphosate use globally.”

The Guardian reported, “In August, authorities from France, Hungary, the Netherlands and Sweden weighed in on the renewal question with a draft report concluding that glyphosate is not carcinogenic.” EFSA and ECHA allowed other parties to comment, up until November 22, 2021, on the issue of glyphosate’s potential re-licensing in 2022. Lead author of the ICR report, Siegfried Knasmueller, issued an earlier report on glyphosate studies in July, titled “Corporate studies asserting herbicide safety show many flaws, new analysis finds.” This study, which reviewed 53 corporate studies submitted to regulators, was requested by the SumOfUs nonprofit organization, and was submitted in response to the November deadline. A spokesperson for EFSA indicated that the body would “develop its opinion” on the matter by June 2022.

The industry research studies reviewed by the ICR team focused on the genotoxicity (ability to cause DNA damage) of glyphosate. This issue is a huge and concerning one because damage to DNA is a well-recognized contributor to the development of cancers. The studies reviewed through the Austrian team’s project maintain that glyphosate is not genotoxic. Yet the IARC (International Agency for Research on Cancer) in 2015 declared not only that glyphosate is a “likely human carcinogen,” but also, that it causes DNA and chromosomal damage in human cells. As Beyond Pesticides noted then,

“Epidemiologic studies have found that exposure to glyphosate is significantly associated with an increased risk of non-Hodgkin’s Lymphoma (NHL).”

In addition, multiple studies have found that glyphosate can induce genetic changes, including statistically significant increases in fatty liver disease and liver cell death. Certainly, the juries in several high-profile glyphosate trials in the U.S. have understood the relationship between glyphosate exposure and development of cancer — and of NHL, in particular.

Professor Siegfried Knasmueller, PhD, the ICR team’s principal investigator — who is an expert in genetic toxicology, a researcher at the Medical University of Vienna’s Cancer Research Institute, and editor-in-chief of two...

The EPA’s PFAS Strategic Roadmap Indicates Considerable New Regulations are Imminent

Husch Blackwell LLP, JD Supra

<https://www.jdsupra.com/legalnews/the-epa-s-pfas-strategic-roadmap-8835733/>

On October 18, 2021, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (“EPA”) issued its highly anticipated PFAS Strategic Roadmap: EPA’s Commitments to Action 2021-2024, setting forth a three-year multi-agency strategy to address per- and polyfluoroalkyl substances (“PFAS”). The plan outlines actions that will fundamentally alter the administrative landscape around PFAS.

PFAS are a diverse group of thousands of chemicals, including hundreds actively used in commerce for decades. They are resistant to water, grease, oil, and heat, which make them persistent in the environment. Because of their lasting properties, PFAS have been used in a wide range of consumer and industrial products including carpeting, paints, stain-resistant fabrics, cleaning products, and fire-fighting foams, among others.

The Strategic Roadmap (“Roadmap”) has a three-pronged approach to address PFAS issues in the environment: 1) research; 2) restriction; and 3) remediation. Under the research prong, the EPA intends to invest in research, development, and innovation to “increase understanding” regarding the different types of PFAS, effective interventions for contamination, and their effects on human health and the environment. Under the restriction prong, the EPA aims to prevent PFAS from entering the environment by regulating production and requiring more in-depth reporting. This includes “plac[ing] the responsibility for limiting exposures and addressing hazards of PFAS on manufacturers, processors, distributors, [and] importers[.]” Finally, under the remediation prong, the EPA aims to “broaden and accelerate the cleanup of PFAS contamination.”

A few of the new regulatory initiatives include the following:

The Potential Designation of PFOS and PFOA as Hazardous Substances Under the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act (“CERCLA”). The two most extensively studied PFAS are perfluorooctanoic acid (“PFOA”) and perfluorooctane sulfonate (“PFOS”). A CERCLA designation as “hazardous” could create issues for a significant number of parties who may become liable to the EPA for the clean-up of contaminated sites. PFAS manufacturers, product manufacturers, airports, water treatment facilities, and landfills are only a handful of the entities that may be subject to liability for clean up under CERCLA. Additionally, in spring 2022, the EPA plans to issue an “advance notice of proposed rulemaking” to seek input on whether it should designate other “various” currently unnamed PFAS as hazardous substances as well. The Roadmap indicates the “proposed rulemaking” is expected to be ready for public comment in Spring 2022.

Finalization of PFAS Reporting Under the Toxic Substances Control Act (“TSCA”). In June 2021, the EPA published a proposed rule under TSCA regarding data-gathering that seeks to collect information on any PFAS manufactured or imported since 2011. This incredibly broad proposed rule will require manufacturers and importers to report information on uses, production volumes, byproducts, exposure, disposal, and hazards of all PFAS manufactured or imported for the last decade. Businesses will have one year from the effective date of the final rule to submit all information to the EPA. The Roadmap indicates the EPA plans to finalize this rule by January 1, 2023.

Establishing Nationwide Drinking Water Limits. While several states have drinking water limits for some PFAS substances, the EPA, to date, has not established similar limits. The Roadmap outlines a plan to have a final rule for drinking water regulation by the Fall of 2023. A national drinking water limit will require every state to assess the concentration of PFOA and PFOS in their drinking water, and to create treatment systems and permit limits to comply with the drinking water limits.

The Evaluation of PFAS Air Emissions. The EPA will create the “technical foundation” required to evaluate PFAS air emissions under the Clean Air Act. The Roadmap...

++++
+

For more news, visit:

- Inside EPA: <https://insideepa.com/>
- Inside TSCA: <https://insideepa.com/inside-tsca-home>
- Bloomberg Environment and Energy: <https://news.bloombergenvironment.com/environment-and-energy/>

This email inbox is not regularly monitored. If you'd like to be removed or would like to add someone to the listserv please contact Bailey Rosen at Rosen.Bailey@epa.gov or Olivia Brinks at Brinks.Olivia@epa.gov. Feedback, questions, and interesting articles are welcomed. Thanks and enjoy!